

11 MARLIN ARD,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 HILARY BOYD, et al.,
15 Defendants.

11 Case No. 22-cv-03764-LB

**12 ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO
13 THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

14 Re: ECF No. 1

17 The Oregon Supreme Court suspended Marlin Ard, an Oregon-based attorney, from the
18 practice of law for one year, effective February 28, 2022. He sued the Oregon Supreme Court
19 justices in this case.¹ There is a similar lawsuit in the District of Oregon involving at least some of
20 the same defendants.² The court's earlier order to show cause sets forth the facts in more detail and
21 directed Mr. Ard to respond by September 16, 2022, about whether there is venue in the Northern
22 District of California.³ He responded that he does not oppose transfer.⁴ The court's earlier order

24
25 ¹ Compl. – ECF No. 1; Opinion, Ex. 2 to *id.* – ECF No. 1-3 at 1. Citations refer to material in the
26 Electronic Case File (ECF); pinpoint citations are to the ECF-generated page numbers at the top of
documents.

27 ² Am. Compl., *Ard v. Or. State Bar*, No. 20-cv-02143-JR (D. Or. Nov. 22, 2021), ECF No. 47.

28 ³ Order – ECF No. 46.

⁴ Resp. to Order – ECF No. 53.

sets forth the legal standards for venue and transfer.⁵ There is no connection with this forum, there likely is no personal jurisdiction, and venue is proper in the District of Oregon. The court transfers the case to the District of Oregon for lack of venue. (Unlike the pending dispositive motion to dismiss, which requires the consent of all parties, even non-appearing defendants, for the court to decide it, *see Williams v. King*, 875 F.3d 500, 503 (9th Cir. 2017), the transfer for lack of venue is not dispositive and does not require the consent of all parties, *In re U.S. Dep’t of Educ.*, 25 F.4th 692, 698–99 (9th Cir. 2022).)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 19, 2022

WBC

LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California

28 | ⁵ Order – ECF No. 46.